



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,001	01/19/2006	Laurent Labrousse	284320US0PCT	5146
22850	7590	03/11/2010		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER MCDONALD, RODNEY GLENN	
			ART UNIT 1795	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 03/11/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/565,001	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LABROUSSE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Rodney G. McDonald	<b>Art Unit</b> 1795	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                        | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Finley (U.S. PG PUB 2002/0045073) in view of Honjo et al. (EP 1 182 174 A1).

Regarding claim 21, Finley teach a method of preparing a material exhibiting photocatalytic properties comprising a coating at least partially crystallized titanium dioxide. (Paragraph 0027) Finley teach depositing titanium dioxide in amorphous form on at least a first face of a glass or glass ceramic substrate by cathode sputtering. (Paragraph 0003, 0028, 0043) Finley teach providing beforehand one or more functional multilayers. (Paragraphs 0031-0036) Finley teach depositing on at least a

Art Unit: 1795

second face of the substrate one or more functional solar control or low emissive multilayers, one or more solar control or low emissive functional layers, or a combination thereof by sputtering. (Paragraph 0031, 0032, 0035, 0036) Finley suggests subjecting the substrate to one or more post-coating heating operations such as annealing or tempering. The one or more heating steps read on Applicant's two heating steps with one of the steps being a crystallization step. (Paragraph 0039) Finley suggests heating the substrate to a temperature of greater than 630 degrees C to promote crystallization. (Paragraph 0038, Paragraph 0045, Table 1, Table IV (Example 56 636 degrees C), Table V)

The differences between Finley and the present claims is that the temperature of the heating step is not discussed (Claim 21) and the heating step further including bending is not discussed (Claim 22).

Regarding claims 21, 22, Finley already suggests one or more post coating heating operations. One if not both promote crystallization. (See Finley discussed above) Honjo et al. teach that the temperature for a heating step that can include bending and/or tempering includes a temperature from 560 to 700 degrees C. (Honjo et al. Paragraph 0013)

The motivation for utilizing the features of Honjo et al. is that it allows for bending the substrate. (See Paragraph 0013)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Finley et al. by utilizing the features of Hondo et al. because it allows for forming a bent substrate.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Finley et al. in view of Hondo et al. as applied to claims 21 and 22 above, and further in view of Krisko et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,964,731).

The difference not yet discussed is the deposition on the at least first and second faces being carried out in line simultaneously or almost simultaneously along substantially identical directions and in opposite senses is not discussed (Claim 23).

Regarding claim 23, Krisko et al. teach in Fig. 5 sputtering in line to form coatings on both faces of the substrate. (See Fig. 5)

The motivation for utilizing the features of Krisko et al. is that it allows for forming coatings on both sides of the substrate. (Column 12 lines 33-36)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the features of Krisko et al. because it allows for forming coatings on both sides of the substrate.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Finley et al. in view of Hondo et al. as applied to claims 21 and 22 above, and further in view of Thelen (U.S. Pat. 3,914,023).

The difference not yet discussed is depositing a layer of silicon dioxide on the substrate and wherein the titanium dioxide is deposited on the layer of silicon dioxide. (Claim 24)

Regarding claim 24, Thelen teach forming a layer of silicon dioxide on the substrate and wherein the titanium dioxide is deposited on the layer of silicon dioxide. (Fig. 4; Column 3 lines 56-64; Column 6 lines 25-30)

The motivation for utilizing the features of Thelen is that it allows for producing a wide-band multilayer interference filter. (Column 1 lines 55-56)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have utilized the features of Thelen because it allows for producing a wide-band multilayer interference filter.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed December 11, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the argument that there is no pattern from Finley's data to show higher temperatures produce more anatase the film, it is agreed that there is no pattern to show this feature and the statement in the rejection "From Tables IV the higher the temperature treatment the more anatase the film" has been removed. However the scope of the claim requires that the titanium dioxide should be heated to greater than 630 degrees C to at least partially crystallize the film where the at least partially crystallized film is in anatase form. Finley clearly shows that at 636 degrees C (i.e. Table IV EXAMPLE 56) the film will at least partially crystallize and that the at least partially crystallized film will be in anatase form. This at least suggests the scope of the claim limitations. The claim as amended also requires depositing the film initially in an amorphous form. Finley teach in paragraph 0003 and 0043 depositing the film in amorphous form and then at least partially crystallizing the film to have an at least partial anatase form. (See Finley discussed above)

In response to the argument that applicant's results are unexpected, it is argued that as Finley shows at 636 degrees C (i.e. Table IV EXAMPLE 56) the film will at least partially crystallize and that the at least partially crystallized film will be in anatase form as such the results are unexpected. (See Finley discussed above)

In response to the argument that the combination of Honjo with Finley would lead one of ordinary skill in the art away from utilizing temperatures above 630 degrees C, it is argued that since Finley teach produced of at least partially anatase form at 636 degrees C one of ordinary skill in the art would not be lead away from using temperatures above 630 degrees C. (See Finley discussed above)

In response to the argument that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have replaced  $ZrO_2$  with  $SiO_2$  because  $ZrO_2$  of cubic form converts titanium dioxide into anatase form whereas amorphous  $SiO_2$  does not, it is argued that the scope of the claim requires only that a layer of silicon dioxide be deposited on the substrate and that titanium dioxide be deposited on the silicon dioxide. Thelen teach a layer of silicon dioxide be deposited on the substrate and that titanium dioxide be deposited on the silicon dioxide. Here the layer of titanium dioxide while capable of having intermediate layers is still on the silicon dioxide layer. (See Thelen discussed above)

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rodney G. McDonald whose telephone number is 571-272-1340. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th with every Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam X. Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 1795

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rodney G. McDonald/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795

Rodney G. McDonald  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1795

RM  
March 4, 2010